

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 14-39, 41-69 and 81-88 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12, 14-18, 27-39, 41-46 and 83-88 are withdrawn from consideration in the application. Claims 19-26, 47-69, 81 and 82 remain and have been rejected.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112**

Claim 25, 57-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102**

Claims 19-26, 47-54 and 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Guest (US 6,490,093).

Claims 19-21, 23, 25-26, 47-49, 51, 53, 65-67 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goggins (US 6,635,196), hereinafter Goggins ‘196.

Claims 57-59 and 61-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goggins (US 6,490,092), hereinafter Goggins ‘092.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103**

Claims 54-56 and 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goggins ‘196.

Claims 55-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guest.

Claims 60 and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goggins ‘092.

**DISCUSSION**

Claims 19, 25, 47, 57, and 65 have been amended. The amendments are supported in the specification, including drawings, as originally filed.

Claims 19, 47, and 65 have been amended to state that the textured or roughened sleeve comprises a unitary textured or roughened layer that has a first textured or roughened surface and a second surface. The second surface has an ink layer bonded to it. Claims 19 and 47 further require that there be a bonding and thermal protection substrate attached to the ink layer.

Claims 19 and 47 have further been amended to remove the statement that the textured or roughened layer comprise first and second ends for contact to one another to form a seam, and first and second edges between the first and second ends. This language is redundant in view of the definition of “closed surface” at page 17, lines 13-23 of the specification.

Claim 57 has further been amended to remove the statement that the textured or roughened layer comprises first and second opposed ends. This language is redundant in view of the definition of “closed surface” at page 17, lines 13-23 of the specification.

Claims 25 and 57 have been amended to remove the statement that the textured or roughened layer comprises a random collection of features. This amendment obviates the rejection of claim 25 and 57-64 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 19-26, 47-54 and 65-69 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Guest. Guest fails to show a construction in which the texture or roughened comprises a unitary layer. To the contrary, Guest teaches a lenticular layer 20 that comprises multiple layers (layers 24, 28, and 30). See Fig. 2.

Claims 19-21, 23, 25-26, 47-49, 51, and 53 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goggins ‘196. Goggins ‘196 fails to show a bonding and thermal protection layer (i.e., a single layer that provides this feature). To the contrary, Goggins ‘196 teaches that separate layers are required to achieve this result. See column 4, lines 33-62.

Claims 65-67 and 69 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goggins ‘196. Goggins ‘196 fails to show a plastic base layer having a recessed region in which the sleeve is located so that the textured or roughened outer surface faces away from the recessed region.

Claims 57-59 and 61-62 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goggins ‘092. Goggins ‘092 fails to show a bonding and thermal protection layer (i.e., a single layer that provides this feature). To the contrary, Goggins ‘092 teaches that

separate layers are required to achieve this result. See column 9, lines 28-47; and column 10, lines 21-46.

Claims 54-56 and 81-82 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goggins '196. Claims 55-56 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guest. Claims 60 and 63-64 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goggins '092.

These claims (claims 54-64 and 81-82) are all dependant from an independent claim that has not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicant has shown that each of the independent claims is patentable. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 54-64 and 81-82 are also patentable.

### CONCLUSION

Based upon the above remarks, it is believed that the rejections have been shown to be inappropriate. Accordingly, reconsideration of those rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 16, 2007

By: James V. Lilly  
James V. Lilly, Reg. No. 27,817  
Customer No. 33072  
Phone: 651-275-9844  
Facsimile: 651-351-2954